REMARKS

Claims 50-54, 56-63, and 65-71 remain in this application. Claims 55 and 64 have been canceled herein. Claims 70 and 71 have been added. Claims 50, 51, and 60 have been amended. By these amendments, no new matter has been added. Reconsideration and review of the application is respectfully requested.

Before addressing the merits of the grounds of the rejection, Applicants provide the following brief description of the invention. As explained in the Applicants' last response, the claimed invention generally relates to a system and method for assessing the information accessible through a wide area network search on an Internet search engine or directory. In response to a query for information located on a computer network, map information is automatically collected or served from memory to provide more detailed information regarding particular "hits" returned by a search engine. The map information can be used, for example, to generate graphical maps summarizing the information to which a Web page provides access. Such maps can diagram links between pages and/or provide a preview of the information (e.g., text or images) on the Web page, such that a person viewing the search results can quickly determine whether a particular result is worthy of further inspection.

The Examiner rejected Claims 50-53, 60-62, 68, and 69 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Weinberg et al. (US 6,237,006). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

With respect to Claim 50, the Examiner asserts that Weinberg et al. disclose a method in which a plurality of pages are mapped, each page having a network address and comprising at least one hyperlink to a related page (col. 1, line 64 – col. 2, line 26). The Examiner states that Weinberg et al. disclose that hyperlinked objects (other web pages) and non-hyperlinked objects (images, audio files, video files, etc.) are automatically selected for the mapping process (col. 8, lines 32-50). According to the Examiner, additional information or properties for each page, object, and link are defined and displayed on the map disclosed by Weinberg et al. when a user zooms in

the view of the map (col. 2, lines 10-57). The Examiner acknowledges that Weinberg et al. fail to disclose a method in which one object must be selected for each of the target pages. The Examiner concludes, however, that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the method taught by Weinberg et al. allows the user to select at least one object from each target page because the method of Weinberg et al. allows the user to select any and all objects on the map, which would include one from each target page.

Applicants traverse this rejection and the Examiner's characterization of the cited reference. A closer examination of the Weinberg et al. reveals fundamental differences between the database management method in Weinberg et al. and the Web page information assessment method recited in Claim 50. Weinberg et al. disclose a diagnostic tool to be used by a Webmaster in evaluating the performance and effectiveness of Web sites. The diagnostic tool of Weinberg et al. shows the relationships between interlinked web pages using star or tree-type diagrams, but does not provide a preview of the displayed content of the web pages. *See, e.g.*, Figs. 1-6.

Furthermore, in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for a claim, the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. M.P.E.P. §2143 (Sept. 2005); *see also* CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup International Corp., 349 F.3d 1333, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2003) ("obviousness requires a suggestion of all limitations in a claim") (citing In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (CCPA 1974)). Thus, to sustain the foregoing rejection of Claim 50, Weinberg et al. must identically teach or suggest every element of Claim 50, arranged as in Claim 50. The Applicant respectfully submits that Weinberg et al. fail to teach or suggest every element of Claim 50. For example, Weinberg et al. fail to teach a method comprising: (a) automatically selecting "a block of text from at least one of the target pages or the linked related pages having text" and "an image file from at least one of the target pages or the linked related pages displaying an image;" and (b) "generating a reduced-size image from the selected image file." Furthermore, Weinberg et al. fail to disclose a method that involves generating map information for the target pages and each set of linked related pages, wherein the map information comprises

"the block of text, the reduced-size image, and a descriptor of each of the objects selected from each set ... such that a user can quickly preview and assess informational content of the hyper-linked pages by viewing the map information," as recited in Claim 50.

In contrast to the method recited in Claim 50, Weinberg et al. teach a method for generating a hierarchical tree representation of a Web site in which each content object (HTML documents, GIF files, etc.) of the Web site is represented as a node on the tree. Col. 2, lines 10-48. Each of the nodes are represented with an icon, rather than as an actual block of text or reduced-size image from the target pages or linked related pages. *Id.*

Claims 51-53, which depend from Claim 50, are deemed patentable for the same reasons stated above with respect to Claim 50, and because of the additional limitations set forth therein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 50-53 be withdrawn.

With respect to Claim 60, the Examiner states that Claim 60 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as Claim 50, and has rejected Claim 60 along the same rationale as the basis for rejecting Claim 50. However, analogous to the reasons for why the rejection of Claim 50 should be withdrawn, Weinberg et al. fail to teach a system that is operably associated with a memory holding executable instructions for: (a) automatically selecting "a block of text from at least one of the target pages or the linked related pages having text" and "an image file from at least one of the target pages or the linked related pages displaying an image;" and (b) "generating a reduced-size image from the selected image file." Furthermore, Weinberg et al. fail to disclose a system with instructions for generating map information for the target pages and each set of linked related pages, wherein the map information comprises "the block of text, the reduced-size image, and a descriptor of each of the objects selected from each set ... such that a user can quickly preview and assess informational content of the hyper-linked pages by viewing the map information," as recited in Claim 60.

Claims 61, 62, 64, 68, and 69, which depend from Claim 60, are deemed

LA2:761720.3

patentable for the same reasons stated above with respect to Claim 60, and because of the additional limitations set forth therein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 60-62, 64, 68, and 69 be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected Claims 54, 56-58, 63, and 65-67 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Weinberg et al. in view of Astiz et al. (US 6,035,330). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

With respect to Claims 54, 56-58, 63, and 65-67, the Examiner acknowledges that Weinberg et al. fail to teach certain elements of these claims (e.g., accessing map information by selecting an identifier from a list, accessing information stored in a database by using a mouse to select the original page, etc.). The Examiner asserts that Astiz et al. disclose a method of mapping a web page in which the map itself and the corresponding data are stored in a database, from which they can be recalled by users (col. 5, line 68 – col. 6, line 20). According to the Examiner, Astiz et al. also disclose using a mouse to access maps stored in a database by selecting the page to which the map corresponds (col. 9, line 31 – col. 10, line 50). The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Weinberg et al. with the method of Astiz et al. because it would result in a more organized way of accessing the data contained in memory.

To sustain the foregoing rejection of Claims 54, 56-58, 63, and 65-67, Weinberg et al., alone or in combination with Astiz et al., must identically teach or suggest every element of each claim, arranged as in each claim. M.P.E.P. §2143 (Sept. 2005). The Applicant respectfully submits that Weinberg et al. and Astiz et al., individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every element of any of Claims 54, 56-58, 63, and 65-67. For example, Weinberg et al., alone or in combination Astiz et al., fail to teach methods/instructions for: (a) automatically selecting "a block of text from at least one of the target pages or the linked related pages having text" and "an image file from at least one of the target pages or the linked related pages displaying an image;" and (b) "generating a reduced-size image from the selected image file." Also, Weinberg et al., alone or in combination Astiz et al., fail to teach methods/instructions that involve

LA2:761720.3

generating map information for the target pages and each set of linked related pages, wherein the map information comprises "the block of text, the reduced-size image, and a descriptor of each of the objects selected from each set ... such that a user can quickly preview and assess informational content of the hyper-linked pages by viewing the map information."

Furthermore, Claims 54 and 56-58, which depend from Claim 50, are deemed patentable for the same reasons stated above with respect to Claim 50, and because of the additional limitations set forth therein. Similarly, Claims 63 and 65-67, which depend from Claim 60, are deemed patentable for the same reasons stated above with respect to Claim 60, and because of the additional limitations set forth therein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 54, 56-58, 63, and 65-67 be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected Claims 55 and 64 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Weinberg et al. in view of Bloomberg (US 5,765,176). Claims 55 and 64 have been canceled herein, without prejudice, to reduce the number of pending claims and expedite review of the remaining claims of the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims of the same or similar scope in one or more continuing applications.

The Examiner rejected Claim 59 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Weinberg et al. in view of Astiz et al., and further in view of Sitka (US 6,330,572). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to Claim 59, the Examiner acknowledges that neither Weinberg et al. nor Astiz et al. disclose a method of deleting items from the map database after a predetermined amount of time. The Examiner asserts that Sitka discloses a method of database management in which items contained within a database can be automatically deleted based on the amount of time they have been in the database (col. 17, line 54 – col. 18, line 3). The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the method of Sitka to the mapping system because Sitka's method would have allowed automatic database

LA2:761720.3

"house cleaning."

To sustain the foregoing rejection of Claim 59, Weinberg et al., individually or in combination with Astiz et al. and/or Sitka, must identically teach or suggest every element of each claim, arranged as in each claim. M.P.E.P. §2143 (Sept. 2005). The Applicant respectfully submits that Weinberg et al., individually or in combination with Astiz et al. and/or Sitka, fail to teach or suggest every element of any of Claim 59. For example, Weinberg et al., individually or in combination with Astiz et al. and/or Sitka, fail to teach methods/instructions for: (a) automatically selecting "a block of text from at least one of the target pages or the linked related pages having text" and "an image file from at least one of the target pages or the linked related pages displaying an image;" and (b) "generating a reduced-size image from the selected image file." Also, Weinberg et al., individually or in combination with Astiz et al. and/or Sitka, fail to teach methods/instructions that involve generating map information for the target pages and each set of linked related pages, wherein the map information comprises "the block of text, the reduced-size image, and a descriptor of each of the objects selected from each set ... such that a user can quickly preview and assess informational content of the hyper-linked pages by viewing the map information."

Furthermore, Claim 59, which depends from Claim 50, is deemed patentable for the same reasons stated above with respect to Claim 50, and because of the additional limitations set forth therein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 59 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 50-54, 56-63, and 65-71 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested, and a timely Notice of Allowability is solicited. If it would be helpful to placing this application in condition for allowance, Applicants encourage the Examiner to contact the undersigned counsel and conduct a telephonic interview.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a three-month extension of time, extending to October 31, 2005, the period for response to the Office Action dated April 29, 2005. A check in the amount of $905.00 is enclosed for the three-month extension of time ($510.00) pursuant to 37 CFR §1.17(a)(3) and for request for continued examination (RCE) ($395.00) pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.17(e). The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0639.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 31, 2005

Brian M. Berliner
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 34,549

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899
Telephone: (213) 430-6000

LA2:761720.3